

REMARKS

Claim 72 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because of insufficient antecedent basis for the recited 'first and second strings'. Claim 72 has been amended to recite "second and third strings", thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 72 has also been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for being in improper dependent form. Claim 72 has been amended to depend from Claim 71 (rather than Claim 75), thereby meeting the requirements of 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claims 37-43 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent 7,012,555. Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with the present Response, thereby overcoming this double patenting rejection.

Claim 78 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eck et al. (US 2003/0011464).

Claim 78 recites "a first reference terminal, a second reference terminal, and a plurality of impedance devices coupled between the first and second reference terminals".

The Examiner's rejection indicates that the two terminals labeled V_{ss} in Fig. 6 of Eck et al. correspond with "a first reference terminal" and "a second reference terminal" as recited by Claim 78. The Examiner's rejection also indicates that the variable resistors 402a and 402b in Fig. 6 of Eck et al. correspond with 'impedance devices' as recited by Claim 78. However, variable resistors 402a and 402b are not coupled between the two V_{ss} terminals. In fact, the two V_{ss} terminals are both connected to ground. (Eck et al., Table 1.) Thus, Eck et al. fail to teach 'a plurality

of impedance devices coupled between the first and second reference terminals' as recited by Claim 78.

In addition, Claim 78 recites "at least one first structure, with each said first structure comprising a permanently-on switch in parallel with one of the impedance devices".

The Examiner argues that each of switches 406a and 406b of Eck et al. correspond with a 'first structure' as recited by Claim 78. However, Eck et al. teach that switch 406a 'is adapted to couple the third node P_B to either V_{SS} (ground) or no connection (nc)'. (Eck et al., paragraphs [00237] and [0044].) In neither case is switch 406a "in parallel with" variable resistor 402a. In fact, switch 406a is connected in series with variable resistor 402a. Moreover, because Eck et al. teach that switch 406a has two functional states, Eck et al. fail to teach that switch 406a is 'permanently-on' as recited by Claim 78. (Note that the same arguments apply to switch 406b and variable resistor 402b.)

For these additional reasons, Claim 78 is not anticipated by Eck et al.

Claims 79-82 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck et al. in view of Brunolli et al. (US 2001/0038351).

Claims 79-82, which depend from Claim 78, are allowable over Eck et al. for at least the same reasons as Claim 78. Brunolli et al. explicitly teach that each of switches S_1 - S_{12} is switched on and off during normal operation. (See, e.g., Brunolli et al., Fig. 4, wherein each switch has on and off states.) Thus, Brunolli et al. fail to remedy the above described deficiencies of Eck et al. Consequently, Claims 79-82 are allowable over Eck et al. in view of Brunolli et al.

CONCLUSION

Claims 37-113 are pending in the present application. Because the Applicants believe that all rejections have been overcome, the Applicants request the issuance of a Notice of Allowability for Claims 37-113. If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at (925) 895-3545 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Hoffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

E. Eric Hoffman
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 38,186

Customer No.: 22888